

Time 1/Time 2 Paired Pilot Data as of July 30, 2001

Research and Performance Outcome Development Unit



Record Counts by County

COUNTY

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Alameda	14	8.2	8.2	8.2
	Kern	23	13.5	13.5	21.8
	Sacramento	88	51.8	51.8	73.5
	San Benito	1	.6	.6	74.1
	San Joaquin	1	.6	.6	74.7
	Stanislaus	6	3.5	3.5	78.2
	Sutter-Yuba	2	1.2	1.2	79.4
	Tri-City	14	8.2	8.2	87.6
	Tulare	13	7.6	7.6	95.3
	Ventura	8	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	170	100.0	100.0	



Time 1 Record Counts by Timeframe Groups

Timeframe 1

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Intake	86	50.6	51.2	51.2
	Mid-Treatment	68	40.0	40.5	91.7
	Planned Discharge	6	3.5	3.6	95.2
	Unplanned Discharge	5	2.9	3.0	98.2
	Left Service Area	1	.6	.6	98.8
	Death	1	.6	.6	99.4
	Other/Unknown	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		170	100.0		



Time 1 Record Counts by Timeframe Groups

Timeframe 2

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Intake	16	9.4	9.5	9.5
	Mid-Treatment	67	39.4	39.6	49.1
	Planned Discharge	41	24.1	24.3	73.4
	Unplanned Discharge	32	18.8	18.9	92.3
	Left Service Area	4	2.4	2.4	94.7
	Aged Out	1	.6	.6	95.3
	Other/Unknown	8	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	169	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		170	100.0		



Record Counts by Gender

Gender

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Female	76	44.7	48.7	48.7
	Male	80	47.1	51.3	100.0
	Total	156	91.8	100.0	
Missing		14	8.2		
Total		170	100.0		





Record Counts by Ethnicity

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	11	6.5	6.5	6.5
Valid	White				
	vvriite	76	44.7	44.7	51.2
	Hispanic	51	30.0	30.0	81.2
	African American	23	13.5	13.5	94.7
	Other Asian or Pacific Islander	2	1.2	1.2	95.9
	Native American	3	1.8	1.8	97.6
	Other	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
	Unknown/Not Reported	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	170	100.0	100.0	

Record Counts by Primary Diagnosis

Primary Diagnostic Category

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Developmental Disorder	5	2.9	3.3	3.3
	Other	6	3.5	4.0	7.3
	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder	24	14.1	16.0	23.3
	Disruptive Behavioral Adjustment	31	18.2	20.7	44.0
	Adjustment Disorder	30	17.6	20.0	64.0
	Anxiety Disorder	9	5.3	6.0	70.0
	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	17	10.0	11.3	81.3
	Psychotic Disorder	1	.6	.7	82.0
	Mood and Affective Disorder	27	15.9	18.0	100.0
	Total	150	88.2	100.0	
Missing	Unknown/Missing	20	11.8		
Total		170	100.0		



Record Counts by Secondary Diagnosis

Secondary Diagnostic Category

		_	5	V " I D	Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Other	18	10.6	38.3	38.3
	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder	8	4.7	17.0	55.3
	Disruptive Behavioral Adjustment	2	1.2	4.3	59.6
	Adjustment Disorder	1	.6	2.1	61.7
	Anxiety Disorder	2	1.2	4.3	66.0
	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	5	2.9	10.6	76.6
	Mood and Affective Disorder	7	4.1	14.9	91.5
	Substance Abuse Disorder	4	2.4	8.5	100.0
	Total	47	27.6	100.0	
Missing	Unknown/Missing	123	72.4		
Total		170	100.0		



Record Counts by Age Groups

Age Category

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	< 5	9	5.3	5.8	5.8
	5 - 8	34	20.0	21.9	27.7
	9 - 11	49	28.8	31.6	59.4
	12 - 14	40	23.5	25.8	85.2
	15 - 16	15	8.8	9.7	94.8
	17 - 18	8	4.7	5.2	100.0
	Total	155	91.2	100.0	
Missing	System	15	8.8		
Total		170	100.0		



CHANGES IN SCORES BETWEEN TIME 1 & TIME 2

NOTE: These are preliminary analyses only – additional Time 1/Time 2 pairs are needed before results can be interpreted.



Change in CAFAS Scores (130 Scored Records)

★46.2% Got Better(T2 – T1 = Negative Change)

 \star 35.4% Stayed the Same (T2 – T1 = 0)

★18.5% Got Worse (T2 – T1 = Positive Change)



Change in CAFAS Scores Correlations with Risk Factors

- ★Parent Other Children in Foster Care corr = .189 (sig = 0.046)
- *Child Drug Use corr = -.247 (sig = 0.007)
- **★**Child Law Violations corr = -.246 (sig = 0.007)
- *Child Gang Member corr = -.214 (sig = 0.021)



Change in Ohio Agency Worker Problem Scores (140 Scored Records)

★64.3% Got Better (T2 – T1 = Negative Change)

* 10.7% Stayed the Same (T2 - T1 = 0)

★25.0% Got Worse (T2 – T1 = Positive Change)



Change in Ohio Agency Worker Problem Scores - Correlations with Risk Factors

*Child Neglected

corr = -.216 (sig = 0.022)



Change in Ohio Parent Problem Scores (93 Scored Records)

★50.5% Got Better (T2 – T1 = Negative Change)

*7.5% Stayed the Same (T2 - T1 = 0)

*42.0% Got Worse (T2 − T1 = Positive Change)



Change in Ohio Parent Problem Scores - Correlations with Risk Factors

- **★Parent History of Physical Abuse** corr = -.307 (sig = 0.036)
- *Child History of Physical Abuse corr = -.271 (sig = 0.033)
- **★**Child Exposure to Domestic Violence corr = -.253 (sig = 0.045)



Change in Ohio Youth Problem Scores (40 Scored Records)

*55.0% Got Better (T2 – T1 = Negative Change)

* 10.0% Stayed the Same (T2 - T1 = 0)

★35.0% Got Worse (T2 – T1 = Positive Change)



Change in Ohio Youth Problem Scores - Correlations with Risk Factors

★Parent History of Physical Abuse corr = -.416 (sig = 0.048)



Change in Ohio Problem Scores Correlations between Informants

- *Agency Worker & Parent corr = .388 (sig = 0.000)
- *Agency Worker & Youth corr = .435 (sig = 0.006)
- *Parent & Youth corr = .539 (sig = 0.001)



Change in Ohio Agency Worker Functional Scores (134 Scored Records)

*52.2% Got Better (T2 – T1 = Positive Change)

*11.2% Stayed the Same (T2 - T1 = 0)

★36.6% Got Worse (T2 – T1 = Negative Change)



Change in Ohio Agency Worker Functional Scores - Correlations with Risk Factors

*Child Neglected

corr = .201 (sig = 0.040)



Change in Ohio Parent Functional Scores (85 Scored Records)

★45.8% Got Better (T2 – T1 = Positive Change)

*7.1% Stayed the Same (T2 - T1 = 0)

*47.1% Got Worse (T2 − T1 = Negative Change)



Change in Ohio Parent Functional Scores - Correlations with Risk Factors

*Child History of Physical Abuse corr = .302 (sig = 0.024)



Change in Ohio Youth Functional Scores (39 Scored Records)

★58.9% Got Better (T2 – T1 = Positive Change)

* 10.3% Stayed the Same (T2 - T1 = 0)

★30.8% Got Worse (T2 – T1 = Negative Change)



Change in Ohio Youth Functional Scores - Correlations with Risk Factors

*NONE



Change in Ohio Functional Scores Correlations between Informants

- *Agency Worker & Parent corr = .370 (sig = 0.001)
- *Agency Worker & Youth No Correlation
- *Parent & Youth corr = .549 (sig = 0.001)



Correlations between Changes in CAFAS and Ohio Scale Scores

- * CAFAS & Agency Worker Problem Scale corr = .583 (sig = 0.000)
- * CAFAS & Agency Worker Functioning Scale corr = -.446 (sig = 0.000)
- * CAFAS & Parent
 No Correlation
- * CAFAS & Youth
 No Correlation



Comparisons of Changes in CAFAS and Ohio Scale Scores

		CHANGE IN CAFAS SCORE		
CHANGES IN C	CHANGES IN OHIO SCALE			
SCOR	PES	or Got Better	Got Worse	
	Stayed Same	81.4%	45.5%	
Ohio Problem -	or Got Better	(N=70)	(N=10)	
Agency Worker		18.6%	54.5%	
	Got Worse	(N=16)	(N=12)	
	Stayed Same	55.7%	60.0%	
Ohio Problem -	or Got Better	(N=34)	(N=9)	
Parent		44.3%	40.0%	
	Got Worse	(N=27)	(N=6)	
	Stayed Same	70.0%	60.0%	
Ohio Problem -	or Got Better	(N=21)	(N=3)	
Youth		30.0%	40.0%	
	Got Worse	(N=9)	(N=2)	